

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 \* \* \*

6 ELMA HENDERSON,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 THOMAS ROBERT HUGHES, et al.,

10 Defendants.  
11

Case No. 2:16-cv-01837-JAD-CWH

**ORDER**

12 This matter is before the court on plaintiff Elma Henderson's proposed order (ECF No.  
13 240), filed on March 29, 2018.

14 The court previously granted plaintiff's unopposed motion to compel and ordered plaintiff  
15 to submit a proposed order for the court's consideration. (Mot. to Compel (ECF No. 235); Order  
16 (ECF No. 238).) Plaintiff's proposed order does not comply with Local Rule 7-2(f), which  
17 requires a party filing a proposed order to certify to the court that it served the proposed order on  
18 all opposing parties for approval as to form.<sup>1</sup> The court therefore declines to enter plaintiff's  
19 proposed order.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
21

---

22 <sup>1</sup> The full text of Local Rule 7-2(f) is as follows:

23 If the court instructs a prevailing party to file a proposed order, the prevailing party must  
24 serve the proposed order on all opposing parties or attorneys for approval as to form. The  
25 opposing parties (or, if represented by counsel, their attorneys) then have three days after  
26 service of the proposed order to notify the prevailing party of any reason for disapproval;  
27 failure to notify the prevailing party within three days of any reason for disapproval will  
28 be deemed an approval. The prevailing party must then file the order with the word  
PROPOSED in the title and must certify to the court that it served the proposed order and  
that three days have passed and state any reasons for disapproval received (or that none  
were received). Opposing parties who have timely served reasons for disapproval may file  
a competing proposed order within three days of being served with notice that the  
prevailing party filed its proposed order.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant Thomas Robert Hughes must respond to the  
2 discovery requests identified in plaintiff Elma Henderson's motion to compel (ECF No. 235) by  
3 June 1, 2018. Defendant is advised that his responses must comply with the Federal Rules of  
4 Civil Procedure and the court's Local Rules of Practice.

5  
6 DATED: May 1, 2018

7  
8   
9 C.W. HOFFMAN, JR.  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28